



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

GUI0.037US01

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,640	05/19/2005	Frank E. Manning	1275.37US01	5821

51294 7590 05/19/2005

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 NORTHLAND DRIVE
SUITE 390
ST. PAUL, MN 55120

EXAMINER

HAN, MARK K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3763

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

wam 6/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC

CPI Ref. No.: 01-104

Date Sent: 5-27-05

Atty. Initials: MAH



**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/036,640	Applicant(s) MANNING ET AL.	
Examiner Mark K. Han	Art Unit 3763	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
13. ☐ Other: _____.

NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Mark Han
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3763

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph of claims 13-17 and 24-31.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant fails to persuasively argue the propriety of the independent claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The thrust of Applicant's arguments rely on the claim language suggesting that the guide handle is CONNECTED to the proximal end of the outer guide of the catheter. Applicant merely argues that since Dubrul describes a splittable sheath that is REMOVABLE, it cannot be connected to the guide handle. See Applicant's remarks of 14 April 2005, p. 10, lines 10-16. Applicant has failed to successfully rebut the design choice argument asserted by the Examiner. See Official Action of 09 February 2005, p. 4, lines 1-21. The Examiner asserted that one of ordinary skill would have connected the handle to the outer guide as an equivalent alternative. In order to successfully overcome such a rejection, applicant must show that: (1) the Norlander arrangement is substantially different than Applicant's arrangement; (2) the Norlander arrangement is different in its function, the way that it achieves its function and the resulting effect from Applicant's arrangement; OR (3) the Norlander arrangement does not perform equally as well as Applicant's arrangement. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is hereby maintained.


mkh